arXiv:1108.3746v2 [math.DS] 9 Mar 2012

PREVALENCE OF A DOMINATED SPLITTING FOR COCYCLES WITH VALUES IN THE SEMIGROUP OF STOCHASTIC MATRICES

MÁRIO BESSA AND MANUEL STADLBAUER

Abstract. We prove that for a C^0-residual set of stochastic matrices over an ergodic automorphism, the splitting into points with 0 and negative Lyapunov exponent is dominated. Furthermore, if the Lyapunov spectrum contains at least three points, then the Oseledets splitting is dominated and, in particular, the Lyapunov exponents vary continuously. This result extends the dichotomy established by Bochi and Viana to a class of non-accessible cocycles.

1. Introduction: Basic definitions and statement of the results

We begin with the definition of the class of cocycles we are interested in. Therefore, recall that the set of $n \times n$ stochastic matrices, which we will denote by $\mathcal{S}^n$, is the set of $n \times n$ matrices $(a_{ij})_{i,j=1,\ldots,n}$ such that for all $i = 1, ..., n$ we have $\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} = 1$ and $a_{ij} \in [0,1]$ for all $i, j \in \{0, ..., n\}$. Also note that $\mathcal{S}^n$ has a semigroup structure with respect to the standard product of matrices. Furthermore, let M refer to a compact Hausdorff space, $f \colon M \to M$ to a measurable, ergodic automorphism and μ to an f-invariant Borel probability measure in M. For a given map $S \colon M \to \mathcal{S}^n$ we define the linear cocycle

$$L_S \colon M \times \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow M \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (x, v) \longmapsto (f(x), S_x v),$$

and consider the space of cocycles $C^0(M, \mathcal{S}^n)$ over f endowed with the topology defined by the norm

$$[\![S]\!] := \max_{x \in M} \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|v\|=1} \|S_x\|,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ refers to the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Observe that the topology is independent from this choice as all norms on $\mathbb{R}^n$ are equivalent.

As usual, the dynamics is defined by

$$S_x^k := \begin{cases} S_{f^{k-1}(x)} \cdots S_x & \text{if } k > 0 \\ \mathrm{id} & \text{if } k = 0, \end{cases}$$

and, in particular, the cocycle identity $S_x^{k+n} = S_{f^n(x)}^k \cdot S_x^n$ holds.

Since f leaves the probability μ invariant and μ is ergodic, the Oseledets theorem for non-invertible cocycles (see [4]) guarantees that there exist $k \in$

$\{1,\ldots,n\}$, $\lambda_1 > \ldots > \lambda_k \geq -\infty$ (called *Lyapunov exponents*), and for μ-a.e. point $x \in M$ a splitting $\mathbb{R}^n = E_x^{\lambda_1} \oplus \ldots \oplus E_x^{\lambda_k}$ (called *Oseledets splitting*) such that $S_x(E_x^{\lambda_i}) = E_{f(x)}^{\lambda_i}$ if $\lambda_i > -\infty$, $S_x(E_x^{-\infty}) \subset E_{f(x)}^{-\infty}$, and, for $v \in E_x^{\lambda_i} \setminus \{0\}$ and $i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|S_x^n v^i\| = \lambda_i.$$

Since a product of stochastic matrices is stochastic, it follows that $\|S_x^n\| = 1$ for all $x \in M$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, the subspace generated by the unit vector $u = (1, \ldots, 1)/\sqrt{n}$ (with all entries equal to $1/\sqrt{n}$) is a joint invariant subspace. We thus obtain that the largest Lyapunov exponent is equal to zero and hence this subspace is contained in the associated Oseledets subspace E^0.

We now introduce the notion of projective hyperbolicity which is a statement about continuity and uniform separation of the Oseledets subspaces. That is, we say that a nontrivial S-invariant splitting $\mathbb{R}^n_\Lambda = F^1_\Lambda \oplus F^2_\Lambda$ over an f-invariant set $\Lambda \subset M$ is an *m-dominated splitting* if $E_\Lambda^{-\infty} \subset F_\Lambda^2$ and, for every $x \in \Lambda$,

$$\frac{\|S_x^m|_{F_x^2}\|}{\mathfrak{m}(S_x^m|_{F_x^1})} \leq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{1}$$

In here, $\mathfrak{m}$ refers to the co-norm of the operator, that is $\mathfrak{m}(A) = \|A^{-1}\|^{-1}$. Note that the co-norm in this situation is well defined since $E_\Lambda^{-\infty} \subset F_\Lambda^2$ implies that $\ker(S^m(x)|_{F_x^1}) = \{0\}$, and hence $S^m(x)|_{F_x^1}$ is invertible. More generally, we call a S-invariant splitting $F^1 \oplus F^2 \oplus \cdots \oplus F^k$ *dominated* if, for each $j = 1, \ldots, k-1$, the splitting $(F^1 \cdots F^j) \oplus (F^{j+1} \cdots F^k)$ is dominated.

The main result of the paper is the generic existence of a dominated splitting and a dichotomy concerning the continuity of Lyapunov exponents. This might be seen as an extension of the result of Bochi and Viana in [2] that a linear cocycle with values in an accessible group generically either has a trivial Lyapunov spectrum or the Oseledets splitting is dominated (For accessibility and the Bochi-Viana result see Definition 3.1 and Lemma 3.5 below). In order to formulate the result, we refer to $E^{<\lambda}$ as the bundle of elements with Lyapunov exponent smaller than λ, that is, for $x \in M$,

$$E_x^{<\lambda} := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \ : \ \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|S_x^n v\| < \lambda\}.$$

Moreover, we refer to an invariant bundle $V \subset M \times \mathbb{R}^n$ as a uniformly contracting bundle if $\sup_{x\in M} \|S_x^n|_{V_x}\| < 1$.

Main Theorem 1.1. *If $n \geq 2$, then there exists a residual subset $\mathcal{R} \subset C^0(M, \mathcal{S}^n)$ with the following properties. For all $S \in \mathcal{R}$, $E_M^0 = u\mathbb{R}_M$, $E_M^{<0}$ is a uniformly contracting bundle and the splitting $E_M^0 \oplus E_M^{<0}$ is dominated. Furthermore, we either have that*

(1) *the Lyapunov spectrum of S contains two points, or*

(2) *the Lyapunov spectrum of S contains at least three points and the Oseledets subbundles define a dominated splitting.*

Observe that the importance of the theorem stems from its relation to continuity of the Lyapunov exponents. In order to do so, recall that a dominated splitting automatically is continuous (see, e.g., § 2 in [2]). In particular, $E_M^{<0}$ always is a continuous bundle and, if the Lyapunov spectrum of $S \in \mathcal{R}$ contains at least three points, then also the Oseledets splitting is continuous. Furthermore, in this situation the assignment of the Lyapunov exponent to a point is globally defined and varies continuously with respect to the base point. However, if the Lyapunov spectrum only contains two points, then nothing can be said about continuity. It only follows from Oseledets' theorem that the Lyapunov exponent for elements of $E_M^{<0}$ is μ-almost surely constant.

Furthermore, our main theorem is applicable to relative Ruelle operators given by continuous fibred systems. That is, for piecewise affine transformations of $\mathcal{S}^1$, we obtain in proposition 4.1, that the action of the relative Ruelle operator restricted to locally constant functions always admits a dominated splitting. This might be compared with the random Perron-Ruelle-Frobenius theorem in [1] which in our terminology states that, for aperiodic cocycles, $\dim E^0 = 1$ and $E^{<\lambda}$ is a uniformly contracting bundle.

The idea of proof is to employ the dichotomy in [2] for a factor, that is for normal cocycles as introduced below, and then lift the dominated splitting to the original system. Note that it is necessary to consider these cocycles since $\mathcal{S}$ is not accessible.

2. NORMAL COCYCLES

In order to define the normal cocycles associated with $S \in C^0(M, \mathcal{S}^n)$, we consider two mutually orthogonal projections P and Q where P refers to the projection onto the one-dimensional subspace $u\mathbb{R}$ and Q to the projection onto the $(n-1)$-dimensional orthogonal complement N of $u\mathbb{R}$. In order to define an action of S on N, note that $S_x(N)$ is in general not contained in N. For this reason, we define the *normal cocycle* $\hat{L}_S \colon M \times N \to M \times N$ by

$$\hat{L}_S(x, v) = (f(x), Q \circ S_x v) := (f(x), \hat{S}_x v),$$

or equivalently, $\hat{S}_x := Q S_x Q$, and refer to the iterates of the normal cocycle as $\hat{S}_x^k$, that is $\hat{S}_x^k := \hat{S}_{f^{k-1}(x)} \cdots \hat{S}_x$. The following elementary result now shows that the normal cocycle is a factor of the original one.

Lemma 2.1. *We have* $\hat{S}_x^k = Q S_x^k Q$. *In particular,* $S_x^k = P S_x^k + \hat{S}_x^k = P + P S_x^k Q + \hat{S}_x^k$.

Proof. The first assertion follows by induction as follows. Assume that $\hat{S}_x^{k-1} = QS_x^{k-1}Q$. Then, using $P + Q = \mathrm{id}$, $SP = P$ and $PQ = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} QS_x^kQ - \hat{S}_x^k &= QS_{f^{k-1}(x)}(\mathrm{id} - Q)S_x^{k-1}Q \\ &= QS_{f^{k-1}(x)}PS_x^{k-1}Q \\ &= QPS_x^{k-1}Q = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\hat{S}_x^k = QS_x^kQ$. Furthermore, it easily can be seen that $P = PS_x^kP = S_x^kP$. The remaining assertions then follow from

$$S_x^k = (P+Q)S_x^k(P+Q) = P + (P+Q)S_x^kQ = P + PS_x^kQ + \hat{S}_x^k.$$

□

By applying Oseledets' Theorem to $\hat{L}$, we obtain the existence of $\hat{k} \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, of exponents $\hat{\lambda}_1 > \dots > \hat{\lambda}_{\hat{k}} \geq -\infty$, and of a splitting $N_x = \hat{E}_x^{\lambda_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \hat{E}_x^{\lambda_{\hat{k}}}$ for almost all $x \in M$ with the corresponding properties. In order to describe the relation between the splittings, we refer to E^λ as the Oseledets subspace of exponent λ, and set

$$E^{>\lambda} := \bigoplus\nolimits_{\lambda' > \lambda} E^{\lambda'}, \quad E^{\geq\lambda} := \bigoplus\nolimits_{\lambda' \geq \lambda} E^{\lambda'}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *If $\lambda < 0$ is an element of the Lyapunov spectrum of S, then λ is also an element of the Lyapunov spectrum of $\hat{S}$. In particular, $Q(E_x^\lambda) \subset \hat{E}_x^{\geq\lambda} \setminus \hat{E}_x^{>\lambda}$ for almost all $x \in M$.*

Proof. We begin with the case of $\lambda = \infty$. It then follows e.g. from $\|QS_x^n(v)\| \leq \|S_x^n(v)\|$ and the definition of the Oseledets splitting that $Q(E_x^\infty) \subset \hat{E}_x^\infty$ for almost all $x \in M$. Now assume that $\lambda > \infty$ which, in particular, implies that $S_x|_{E_x^\lambda} : E_x^\lambda \to E_{f(x)}^\lambda$ is almost surely invertible.

For $x \in M$, let $\theta(x) := \measuredangle(u_x, E_x^\lambda)$ refer to the non-orientated angle between u_x and E_x^λ, where, with $\langle u_x, v\rangle$ referring to the standard inner product,

$$\measuredangle(u_x, E_x^\lambda) := \inf\left(\left\{\cos^{-1}|\langle u_x, v\rangle| \ : \ v \in E_x^\lambda, \|v\| = 1\right\}\right) \in [0, \pi/2].$$

Since $\lambda \neq 0$ it follows that $\theta(x) > 0$ on a set of full measure and hence there exists $\alpha > 0$ and $A \subset M$ of positive measure with $\theta(x) > \alpha$ for all $x \in A$. As a consequence of ergodicity and invariance of μ there exist, for almost all $x \in M$, a sequence (n_l) with $n_l \nearrow \infty$ and $f^{n_l}(x) \in A$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\|Q(v)\|/\|v\| \geq \sin\alpha$ for all $y \in A$ and $v \in E_y^\lambda$, we obtain

$$1 \geq \limsup_n \|QS_x^n(v)\|/\|S_x^n(v)\| \geq \sin\alpha$$

for almost all $x \in M$ and all $v \in E_x^\lambda \setminus \{0\}$. When restricted to N_x, we have by Lemma 2.1 that $QS_x^n = \hat{S}_x^n$. Hence, for almost all $x \in M$ and all $v \in E_x^\lambda \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log\|S_x^n(v)\| = \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log\|\hat{S}_x^n(Qv)\|.$$

Hence the Lyapunov exponent of $Q(v)$ is almost surely equal to λ. In particular, $Q(v) \in \hat{E}^{\geq\lambda} \setminus \hat{E}^{>\lambda}$. □

2.1. **Projective hyperbolicity.** The notions of dominated splittings introduced above can be extended in full analogy to normal cocycles. Furthermore, note that it is well known that domination implies continuity of the associated splitting. In order to relate the splittings of the cocycles, the following identity applicable to (1) will be essential.

$$
\begin{aligned}
(2)\qquad \frac{\|S_x^m|_{F_x^2}\|}{\mathfrak{m}(S_x^m|_{F_x^1})} &= \sup_{w\in F_x^2\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\|S_x^m(w)\|}{\|w\|} \sup_{v\in S_x^m(F_x^1\setminus\{0\})} \frac{\|(S_x^m|_{F_x^1})^{-1}(v)\|}{\|v\|} \\
&= \sup_{w\in F_x^2\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\|S_x^m(w)\|}{\|w\|} \sup_{v\in F_x^1\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\|v\|}{\|S_x^m(v)\|} \\
&= \frac{\sup_{w\in F_x^2\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\|S_x^m(w)\|}{\|w\|}}{\inf_{v\in F_x^1\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\|S_x^m(v)\|}{\|v\|}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

It is worth noting that this identity combined with $E_\Lambda^{-\infty} \subset F_\Lambda^2$ implies that the minimal Lyapunov exponent in F^1 is bounded away from the maximal exponent of F^2.

We now relate these two concepts of dominated splitting in the following lemma, which is formulated for the slightly more general case of a compact and f-invariant subset Λ of M. The hypothesis of Λ being a compact is crucial in order to apply some abstract invariant manifold paraphernalia (cf. [5]).

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\Lambda \subset M$ be compact and f-invariant. Then Λ admits a dominated splitting structure for S if the normal cocycle $\hat{S}$ admits a dominated splitting with respect to Λ. Furthermore, if $\sup_{x\in\Lambda} \|S_x\| < 1$, then $\dim(E_x^0) = 1$ for all $x \in \Lambda$ and $E_\Lambda^0 \oplus E_\Lambda^{<0}$ is a dominated splitting.*

Proof. We begin with the proof of the first statement. So assume that $N^1 \oplus N^2$ is a given $\hat{m}$-dominated splitting for $\hat{S}$, that is $\|\hat{S}_x^{\hat{m}}|_{N_x^2}\|/\mathfrak{m}(S_x^{\hat{m}}|_{N_x^1}) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Set $F^1 := u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda \oplus N^1$ and note that the sequence

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda \arrow[r] & u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda \oplus N^2 \arrow[r, "Q"] & N^2 \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}
$$

is exact. Moreover, since $\hat{S}$ is a factor of S, the following diagram commutes.

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "S|_{u\mathbb{R}}"] & u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda \oplus N^2 \arrow[r, "Q"] \arrow[d, "S|_{u\mathbb{R}\oplus N^2}"] & N^2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\hat{S}"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda \arrow[r] & u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda \oplus N^2 \arrow[r, "Q"] & N^2 \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}
$$

We now construct an S-invariant subbundle $F^2 \subset N^2 \oplus u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda$ following ideas in the proof of Lemma 2.18 in [5]. In here, it is sufficient to construct a continuous family of linear maps $\sigma_x : N_x^2 \to u\mathbb{R}_x$ such that $S_x(\sigma_x(v), v) = (\sigma_{f(x)}(\hat{S}_x(v)), \hat{S}_x(v))$ for all $x \in M$, or equivalently, by Lemma 2.1,

$$\iota_x \sigma_x + PS_x = \sigma_{f(x)} \circ \hat{S}_x,$$

where ι_x^k stands for the identity seen as an isomorphism from $\mathbb{R}_x^n$ to $\mathbb{R}_{f^k(x)}^n$. We now construct σ as a fixed point of the map defined by

$$\sigma_x \mapsto \iota_{f^{\hat{m}}(x)}^{-\hat{m}} \left(\sigma_{f^{\hat{m}}(x)} \circ \hat{S}_x^{\hat{m}} - PS_x^{\hat{m}} \right) \tag{3}$$

on the bundle of linear maps $L_\Lambda(N_\Lambda^2, u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda)$ equipped with the supremum norm. It follows from equation (2) and the property that $N^1 \oplus N^2$ is $\hat{m}$-dominated splitting, that $[\![\hat{S}^{\hat{m}}|_{N_\Lambda^2}]\!] \leq 1/2$. Therefore, the map defined in (3) is a contraction and an adaption of the Banach fixed point theorem (see [5, Theorem 3.1]) shows that the above map has a fixed point σ in $L_\Lambda(N_\Lambda^2, u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda)$. This proves the existence of σ where the corresponding S-invariant bundle is defined by $F_x^2 := \{(\sigma_x(v), v) \ : \ v \in N_x^2\}$.

It remains to show that $F^1 \oplus F^2$ is a dominated splitting. Note that it follows from domination with respect to $\hat{S}$ that $\inf_{x\in\Lambda} \measuredangle(N_x^1, N_x^2) > 0$. Since $v \mapsto (\sigma_x(v), v)$ is continuous and Λ is compact, we hence have that $\measuredangle(u_x, F_x^2)$ is uniformly bounded away from 0. In particular, for some norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ equivalent to the Euclidean norm, there exists $C > 1$ with $C^{-1}\|v\| \leq \|Q(v)\| \leq \|v\|$ for all $v \in F_x^2$ and $x \in \Lambda$ where the involved constant only depends on the minimal angle and the norm $\|\cdot\|_*$. Hence, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and with $\mathfrak{m}_*$ referring to the co-norm induced by $\|\cdot\|_*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|S_x^k|_{F_x^2}\|_*}{\mathfrak{m}_*(S_x^k|_{F_x^1})} &= \sup_{w\in F_x^2} \frac{\|S_x^k(w)\|_*}{\|w\|_*} \sup_{v\in F_x^1} \frac{\|v\|_*}{\|S_x^k(v)\|_*} \\ &\leq C \sup_{w\in F_x^2} \frac{\|QS_x^k(w)\|_*}{\|Qw\|_*} \sup_{v\in N_x^1, t\in\mathbb{R}} \frac{\|v+tu_x\|_*}{\|tu_x+S_x^k(v)\|_*}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the property of admitting a dominated splitting is independent from the norm on $\mathbb{R}^n = u\mathbb{R} \oplus N$, we may choose $\|v + tu_x\|_* := \|v\| + |t|$. For fixed $v \in N_x^1$ it is then easy to verify that the second term in the above estimate achieves its global maximum for $t = -\|PS_x^k v\|$. We hence obtain

$$\sup_{v\in N_x^1, t\in\mathbb{R}} \frac{\|v + tu_x\|_*}{\|tu_x + S_x^k(v)\|_*} \leq \sup_{v\in N_x^1} \frac{\|v\| + \|PS_x^k v\|}{\|QS_x^k(v)\|} \leq 2 \sup_{v\in N_x^1} \frac{\|v\|}{\|\hat{S}_x^k(v)\|}.$$

By combining the two estimates above, we arrive at

$$\|S_x^k|_{F_x^2}\|_* / \mathfrak{m}_*(S_x^k|_{F_x^1}) \leq 2C \|\hat{S}_x^k|_{N_x^2}\|_* / \mathfrak{m}_*(\hat{S}_x^k|_{F_x^2})$$

and hence $F^1 \oplus F^2$ is an m-dominated splitting for S for each multiple $m \in \mathbb{N}$ of $\hat{m}$ with $2C/2^{m/\hat{m}} \leq 1/2$.

For the proof of the second assertion, assume that $S \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfies $\sup_{x\in\Lambda} \|S_x\| =: \rho < 1$. By the same arguments, it follows from $\rho < 1$ that

$$L_\Lambda(N_\Lambda, u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda) \to L_\Lambda(N_\Lambda, u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda), \quad \sigma_x \mapsto \iota_{f(x)}^{-1} \left(\sigma_{f(x)} \circ \hat{S}_x - PS_x \right)$$

is a contraction and hence has a unique fixed point. With σ referring to the fixed point and $F_x^2 := \{(\sigma_x(v), v) \ : \ v \in N\}$, it then follows as above from continuity of σ and compactness of Λ that the angle of u_x and F_x^2 is bounded uniformly away from 0 for all $x \in \Lambda$. This then implies that the Lyapunov exponents of F_Λ^2 are bounded by $\log \rho$, and, in particular, that $E_\Lambda^{<0} = F_\Lambda^2$ and $E_\Lambda^0 = u\mathbb{R}_\Lambda$. Finally, observe that the arguments above for proving that $F^1 \oplus F^2$ is dominated apply in verbatim to $E_\Lambda^0 \oplus E_\Lambda^{<0}$ (and even can be simplified using $\mathfrak{m}_*(S_x|_{E_x^0}) = 1$). □

As a corollary of the construction of F^2 in the above result, we obtain that $E^0 \oplus E^{<0}$ is a dominated splitting for a generic cocycle.

Corollary 2.4. *If M is compact, then there exists an open and dense subset $\mathcal{R}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\dim(E^0) = 1$, $E^{<0}$ is a uniformly contracting bundle and $E^0 \oplus E^{<0}$ is a dominated splitting for each $S \in \mathcal{R}$.*

Proof. Observe that the map $S \mapsto [\![\hat{S}]\!]$ is continuous. Hence, $\mathcal{R} := \{S \in \mathcal{S} \ : \ [\![\hat{S}]\!] < 1\}$ is open. In order to prove the corollary, it therefore remains to show that $\mathcal{R}$ is dense and then apply Lemma 2.3 in order to obtain that $\dim(E^0) = 1$ and $E^0 \oplus E^{<0}$ is dominated.

In order to prove that $\mathcal{R}$ is dense, we show that

$$\Psi : \mathcal{S} \times [0,1] \to \mathcal{S}, \ (S, \rho) \mapsto S^{(\rho)} := P + \rho(PSQ + \hat{S}).$$

is an isotopy with $S^{(\rho)} \in \mathcal{R}$ for all $\rho < 1$ which continuously connects $S^{(1)} = S \in \mathcal{S}$ with $S^{(0)} = P$. We begin with verifying that $S^{(\rho)} \in \mathcal{S}$. Note that, for $\rho \in [0,1]$,

$$S^{(\rho)}(u) = (P + \rho(PSQ + \hat{S}))u = u, \tag{4}$$

and, with $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ referring to $\{(v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : v_i \geq 0, \ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} v \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \quad & \Rightarrow S(v) \geq 0 \Rightarrow P(v) \geq -(PSQ + \hat{S})(v) \\ & \Rightarrow P(v) \geq -\rho(PSQ + \hat{S})(v) \Rightarrow S^{\widehat{(\rho)}}(v) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

It then follows from (4) and (5) that $S^{(\rho)} \in \mathcal{S}$. In order to see that Ψ is continuous, note that, for $S, T \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\rho, \rho' \in [0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\![S^{(\rho)} - T^{(\rho')}]\!] \quad & = [\![S^{(\rho)} - S^{(\rho')} + S^{(\rho')} - T^{(\rho')}]\!] \\ & \leq |\rho - \rho'| [\![SQ]\!] + \rho' [\![(S-T)Q]\!] \leq |\rho - \rho'| + \rho' [\![S - T]\!]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, Lemma 2.1 implies that $S^{\widehat{(\rho)}} = \rho \hat{S}$. Hence, $\|S^{\widehat{(\rho)}}\| \leq \rho$, and, in particular, $S^{(\rho)} \in \mathcal{R}$ for all $\rho < 1$. □

We now give a short discussion of the continuity of the pertubation in the above corollary from the viewpoint of the Oseledets splitting. For this purpose, we derive a global, uniform estimate for the angle between u and the Oseledets subspaces of negative exponents for μ-a.e. point. The existence of a uniform bound, a result which was not expected by the authors, is a consequence of the global invariance of u.

Lemma 2.5. *Assume that $\lambda < 0$ is a Lyapunov exponent of S. Then $\measuredangle(u_x, E_x^\lambda) \geq \pi/4$ for almost all $x \in M$.*

Proof. Since $\lambda < 0$, it follows that $\|S_x^k(v)\| \to 0$ for all $v \in E_x^\lambda$ and almost all $x \in M$, and as consequence of Lemma 2.2, also $\|\hat{S}_x^k(v)\| \to 0$. Hence, using Lemma 2.1, it follows that $\|P(v) + PS_x^k Q(v)\|$ also tends to zero. Therefore,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} PS_x^k Q(v) = -P(v)$$

for all $v \in E_x^\lambda$ and almost all $x \in M$. Since S_x is a Markov operator for each $x \in M$, we have that $\|S\| = 1$. In particular, $\|PS_x^k Q(v)\| \leq \|Q(v)\|$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which then gives that $\|P(v)\| = \lim_k \|PS_x^k Q(v)\| \leq \|Q(v)\|$. Since P and Q are orthogonal projections, it follows that, for $v \in E_x^\lambda \setminus \{0\}$, $\tan \measuredangle(u_x, v) = \|Q(v)\|/\|P(v)\| \geq 1$. The assertion then follows from $\measuredangle(u_x, E_x^\lambda) = \inf_{v \in E_x^\lambda} \tan^{-1}(\|Q(v)\|/\|P(v)\|) \geq \pi/4$. □

This result reveals that the Oseledets splitting might change discontinuously under the pertubations in the proof of Corollary 2.4. That is, for $\rho \in (0,1)$, we consider the map $\Phi^\rho : \mathbb{R}^n_\Lambda \to \mathbb{R}^n_\Lambda$ defined by $v \mapsto (\sigma_x^{(\rho)}(Qv), Qv)$ where $\sigma^{(\rho)} : N \to u\mathbb{R}$ refers to the lifting obtained in the proof of Lemma 2.3 with respect to $S^{(\rho)}$. It then follows by the above lemma that $\measuredangle(u_x, \Phi_x^\rho(v)) \geq \pi/4$. In particular, if $\dim(E^0) > 1$, then Φ^ρ can not converge to the identity on $E^0 \setminus u\mathbb{R}$ as $\rho \to 1$. However, if $\dim(E^0) = 1$, then the following continuity result holds. In here, $E_x^\lambda(\rho)$ refers to the Oseledets subspace of exponent λ with respect to $S^{(\rho)}$, and $\hat{E}_x^\lambda(\rho)$ to the one of $\widehat{S^{(\rho)}}$, respectively.

Proposition 2.6. *Assume that $\dim(E^0) = 1$. Then, for almost every $x \in M$ and each negative Lyapunov exponent λ, the restriction $\Phi^\rho|_{E_x^\lambda}$ is an isomorphism from E_x^λ to $E_x^{\lambda + \log\rho}(\rho)$. Furthermore, $\lim_{\rho\to 1-} \Phi^\rho(v) = v$ for each $v \in E_x^\lambda$.*

Proof. Throughout this proof, we assume that $\lambda < 0$ is a negative Lyapunov exponent of S. It then follows from $\dim(E^0) = 1$ and Lemma 2.2, that $Q|_{E_x^\lambda}$ is an isomorphism onto $\hat{E}_x^\lambda$. Since $\hat{E}_x^\lambda = \hat{E}_x^{\lambda+\log\rho}(\rho)$, the first assertion follows from the properties of $\sigma^{(\rho)}$. It hence remains to show that $\lim_{\rho\to 1-} \Phi^\rho(v) = v$, or equivalently, $\lim_{\rho\to 1-} \sigma^{(\rho)}(Qv) = Pv$, for $v \in E_x^\lambda$. Therefore, a straightforward induction argument combined with the identity $S^{(\rho)} = P + \rho SQ$ gives that

$$(S^{(\rho)})^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \rho^k \iota^{n-k} P(SQ)^k + \rho^n \hat{S}^n, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For $\rho = 1$ and $v \in E_x^\lambda$ we therefore obtain that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} S^n(v) = \lim_{n\to\infty} (S^{(\rho)})^n(v) = 0$$

and $\lim_n \hat{S}^n v = 0$. In particular, by identifying the range of $\iota^k P$ with $\mathbb{R}$, we obtain

$$P(v) = -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(SQ)^k(v). \tag{6}$$

For $\rho < 1$, it follows from the above that $\Phi^\rho(v) = (\sigma^{(\rho)}(Qv), Qv) \in E_x^{\lambda+\log\rho}(\rho)$. Therefore, $\lim_n (S^{(\rho)})^n(\Phi^\rho(v)) = 0$ and

$$\sigma^{(\rho)}(Qv) = -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Big(P(SQ)^k(v)\Big)\,\rho^k. \tag{7}$$

Set $a_k := P(SQ)^k(v)$ for $k \geq 1$. It follows from (6) that $\sum_{k\geq 1} a_k$ converges. Hence, by Abel's continuity theorem, $\lim_{\rho\to 1-}\sum_{k\geq 1} a_k\rho^k = \sum_{k\geq 1} a_k$. The remaining assertion hence follows from (7). □

3. Accessibility and the proof of the Main Theorem

The proof of our main result relies on the dichotomy established in [2] for cocycles with values in an accessible group. Therefore, we recall the definition of accessibility given in [2, Definition 1.2].

Definition 3.1. *Assume that $\mathfrak{G}$ is an embedded submanifold of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ with or without boundary. We say that $\mathfrak{G}$ is accessible if for all $C > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there are $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha > 0$ satisfying the following properties. Given ξ and η in the projective space $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{P}^{n-1}$ with $\measuredangle(\xi, \eta) < \alpha$ and $S_0, \ldots, S_{N-1}$ in $\mathfrak{G}$ with $\|S_i^{\pm 1}\| < C$, there exist $R_0, \ldots, R_{N-1}$ in $\mathfrak{G}$ such that $\|R_i - S_i\| < \epsilon$ and*

$$R_{N-1} \circ \ldots \circ R_0(\eta) = S_{N-1} \circ \ldots \circ S_0(\xi).$$

The idea of proof of the main theorem is to employ the dichotomy obtained by Bochi and Viana in [2] (see Lemma 3.5 below) to cocycles with values in $Q\mathcal{S}^*Q$, where $\mathcal{S}^*$ refers to the semigroup of invertible elements in $\mathcal{S}$. For this purpose, it is necessary to verify that $\mathcal{S}^*$ is dense in $\mathcal{S}$ and that $Q\mathcal{S}^*Q$ is accessible, that is $Q\mathcal{S}^*Q$ is an embedded submanifold with boundary of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ and that the approximation property in $\mathbb{R}\boldsymbol{P}^{n-1}$ as stated above holds. The final result then follows applying the results obtained in the previous section.

Before proceeding with the proof, note that the result of Bochi and Viana can not be applied directly, since $\mathcal{S}^*$ is not accessible. This can be seen by the following argument. Assume that $S_0, \ldots, S_k$ are elements in $\mathcal{S}^*$. Since u is an eigenvector for all elements of $\mathcal{S}^*$, it follows from invertibility that $S_0 \cdots S_k(v) = u$ if and only if $v = u$. Hence, $R_0 \cdots R_k(\xi) \neq u$ for all $R_0, \ldots, R_k \in \mathcal{S}^*$ and $\xi \neq u$ which gives that $\mathcal{S}^*$ is not accessible.

Observe that $\mathcal{S}$ can be identified with the n-fold product of the unit simplex in $\mathbb{R}^n$, that is, with $\Delta_n := \{(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in [0,1]^n \ : \ x_1 + \ldots + x_n = 1\}$, we have

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(a_{ij})_{1\le i,j\le n} \ : \ (a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \dots, a_{in}) \in \Delta_n \ \forall i = 1, \dots, n\} \cong (\Delta_n)^n.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{S}$ is an embedded submanifold with boundary of the manifold $\mathrm{M}_{n\times n}(\mathbb{R})$ of real valued matrices of dimension $n \times n$ with respect to the canonical manifold structure.

Lemma 3.1. *$\mathcal{S}^*$ is dense and open in $\mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. First observe that a standard argument using the continuity of the determinant implies that $\mathcal{S}^*$ open in $\mathcal{S}$. In order to prove the density of $\mathcal{S}^*$, fix $S \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}^*$ with $v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(n)} \in \Delta_n$ referring to the row vectors of S. Furthermore, set $k := \mathrm{Rank}(S) = \dim(\mathrm{Span}(\{v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(n)}\}))$ and note that non-invertibility implies that $k < n$. Hence there exists l with $v^{(l)} \in V := \mathrm{Span}(\{v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(l-1)}, v^{(l+1)}, \dots, v^{(n)}\})$. Since $k < n$, it follows that for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $w \in \Delta_n \setminus V$ with $\|v^{(l)} - w\| < \epsilon$. By substituting $v^{(l)}$ with w, one obtains $T \in \mathcal{S}$ close to S with $\mathrm{Rank}(T) = \mathrm{Rank}(S) + 1$. The remaining assertion then follows by induction until one obtains an element of $\mathcal{S}$ of full rank. □

In order to prove that $Q\mathcal{S}^*Q$ is an embedded submanifold with boundary, we consider the following affine subspaces of $\mathrm{M}_{n\times n}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathcal{S}} &:= \left\{(a_{ij}) \in \mathrm{M}_{n\times n}(\mathbb{R}) \ : \ \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} = 1 \ \forall i = 1, \dots, n\right\}, \\
\mathcal{A} &:= \left\{(a_{ij}) \in \mathrm{M}_{n\times n}(\mathbb{R}) \ : \ \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n a_{i'j} = \sum_{i=1}^n a_{ij'} = 0 \ \forall i', j' = 1, \dots, n\right\}, \\
\hat{\Delta}_n &:= \left\{(v_j) \in \mathbb{R}^n \ : \ \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n v_j = 1\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, consider the homomorphisms of vector spaces

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa &: \ \mathrm{M}_{n\times n}(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}^n, \ (a_{ij}) \mapsto \left(\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n a_{i1}, \dots, \tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n a_{in}\right), \\
\Theta &: \ \hat{\mathcal{S}} \to \mathcal{A} \times \hat{\Delta}_n, \ S \mapsto (QS, \kappa(S)).
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

It is easy to see, for $S \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}$ and with $(\cdot)_{ij}$ referring to the coordinate (i, j), that $(QS)_{ij} = a_{ij} - (\kappa(S))_j$, which then implies that $(\Theta^{-1}(A, v))_{ij} = (A)_{ij} + v_j$ and that Θ is an isomorphism of vector spaces.

Lemma 3.2. *$Q\mathcal{S}^*Q$ is an embedded submanifold with boundary of* $\mathrm{GL}(N)$.

Proof. We begin identifying $Q\mathcal{S}$ with $\mathcal{M}$, where

$$\mathcal{M} := \left\{(a_{ij}) \in \mathcal{A} \ : \ \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n \min_{i=1,\dots,n} a_{ij} \ge -1\right\}.$$

So assume that $S = (s_{ij}) \in \mathcal{S}$. It then follows from the definition of Θ that $QS \in \mathcal{A}$. Furthermore, since S is a stochastic matrix, we have that $1 \ge \sum_j \min_i a_{ij} \ge 0$. It then follows from $(QS)_{ij} = a_{ij} - (\kappa(S))_j$ that $\sum_j \min_i (QS)_{ij} \ge -1$. Hence, $QS \in \mathcal{M}$ and, in particular, $Q\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{M}$. Now assume that $(b_{ij}) \in \mathcal{M}$ and choose $v \in \Delta_n$ with $-(v)_j \le \min_j b_{ij}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$. It then follows that $(\Theta^{-1}((b_{ij}), v))_{ij} = b_{ij} + v_j \ge 0$.

Furthermore, since $\sum_j b_{ij} + v_j = 1$, we also have that $b_{ij} + v_j \leq 1$. This then implies that $\Theta^{-1}((b_{ij}), v) \in \mathcal{S}$ and, in particular, that $Q\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}$.

In order to see that $\mathcal{M}$ is a submanifold, note that $\mathcal{M}$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A} \cap \bigcap_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} \left\{ (b_{ij}) \in \mathrm{M}_{n\times n}(\mathbb{R}) \ : \ \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^n b_{\sigma(j)j} \geq -1 \right\},$$

where $\mathfrak{S}_n$ stands for the symmetric group on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. Hence, $\mathcal{M}$ is equal to the intersection of the linear subspace $\mathcal{A}$ with finitely many affine half spaces, which proves that $\mathcal{M}$ is an embedded submanifold of $\mathrm{M}_{n\times n}(\mathbb{R})$. The assertion then follows from $QSQ = QS$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$, the fact that $\mathcal{A}$ can be identified with the endomorphisms of N and $QS \in \mathrm{GL}(N)$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}^*$. □

We now proceed with the proof that $Q\mathcal{S}^*Q$ is accessible. For this purpose, we analise the orbit of an element of the positive cone $\mathbb{R}^n_+ := \{(v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \ : \ v_i \geq 0 \ \forall i\}$ under the following subsets of $\mathcal{S}$ which are defined by, for given $\epsilon > 0$ and with δ_{ij} referring to Kronecker's δ-function,

$$\mathcal{S}_\epsilon := \left\{ (s_{ij}) \in \mathcal{S} \ : \ \max_{i,j} |s_{ij} - \delta_{ij}| \leq \epsilon \right\}.$$

Note that, for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, each element of $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon$ is invertible. Moreover, for $v = (v_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, set $\alpha(v) := \min_j v_j$ and $\beta(v) = \max_j v_j$. Using the elementary fact that $[\alpha, \beta] = \{t\alpha + (1-t)\beta \ : \ t \in [0,1]\}$ we then obtain a precise description of the orbit

$$\mathcal{S}_\epsilon(v) = \{S(v) \in \mathbb{R}^n \ : \ S \in \mathcal{S}_\epsilon\}$$

of an element $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ under $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon$. That is, $w = (w_i) \in \mathcal{S}_\epsilon(v)$ if and only if, for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$,

$$\epsilon(\alpha(v) - v_i) \leq w_i - v_i \leq \epsilon(\beta(v) - v_i). \tag{9}$$

For the proof of the main lemma, recall the well known relation $\|v\|_\infty \leq \|v\| \leq \sqrt{n}\|v\|_\infty$ between the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$ and the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, for $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 3.3. *Set* $C := (n-1)\sqrt{n} + 2n(n-1)^2$. *For all* $\epsilon > 0$, $v, w \in N = Q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with* $\|v\| = \|w\| = 1$ *and* $\|v - w\| \leq \epsilon$ *there exist* $S \in \mathcal{S}_{C\sqrt{\epsilon}}$ *and* $t > 0$ *such that* $Sv = tw$.

Proof. The first step in here is to obtain lower bounds for $\beta(v)$ and $|\alpha(v)|$ using the fact that $v, w \in N$. Since the equivalence of norms implies that $\|v\|_\infty \geq \|v\|/\sqrt{n}$, either $\beta(v)$ or $|\alpha(v)|$ is bigger than or equal to $1/\sqrt{n}$. Furthermore, it follows from $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in N$ that $P(v) = (\sum_i v_i)/\sqrt{n} = 0$. We hence obtain, e.g. by analysing the worst case, that

$$\beta(v), |\alpha(v)| \geq \frac{1}{(n-1)\sqrt{n}} =: D^{-1}.$$

The second step is to shrink w in a controlled way by some $t \in (0,1]$ such that $tw \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta_2}(v)$ for some $\delta_2 > 0$. In order to determine t, note that

$\|v-w\|_\infty \leq \|v-w\| \leq \epsilon$ implies that $|\alpha(v)-\alpha(w)| \leq \epsilon$ and $|\beta(v)-\beta(w)| \leq \epsilon$. For $\delta_1 > 0$ to be specified later, let

$$\begin{aligned} t &:= \tfrac{\max(\{\beta(v),|\alpha(v)|\})-\delta_1}{\max(\{\beta(v),|\alpha(v)|\})+\epsilon} \\ &= 1 - \tfrac{\delta_1+\epsilon}{\max(\{\beta(v),|\alpha(v)|\})+\epsilon} \geq 1 - D(\delta_1+\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

For this choice of t, we have $\alpha(v)+\delta_1 \leq \alpha(tw)$, $\beta(tw) \leq \beta(v)-\delta_1$ and

$$\|v-tw\|_\infty \leq \epsilon + (1-t)\|w\|_\infty \leq \epsilon + D(\delta_1+\epsilon).$$

For $\delta_1 := \sqrt{\epsilon}$ and $\delta_2 := (D+2D^2)\sqrt{\epsilon}$ we then obtain $\epsilon \leq \delta_1\delta_2$ and

$$\epsilon + D(\delta_1+\epsilon) \leq (1+2D)\delta_1 = \delta_2/D.$$

In order to verify that $tw \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta_2}(v)$ we consider the following cases for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

(1) If $v_i \geq tw_i$ and $v_i \geq 0$, or $v_i \leq tw_i$ and $v_i \leq 0$, then

$$|v_i - tw_i| \leq \delta_2/D \leq \begin{cases} \delta_2(v_i - \alpha(v)) & : v_i \geq 0, \\ \delta_2(\beta(v) - v_i) & : v_i \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

(2) If $0 \leq v_i \leq tw_i$, then $v_i \leq \beta(v) - \delta_1$, and if $0 \geq v_i \geq tw_i$, then $v_i \geq \alpha(v) + \delta_1$. In particular,

$$|v_i - tw_i| \leq \epsilon \leq \delta_1\delta_2 \leq \begin{cases} \delta_2(\beta(v) - v_i) & : 0 \leq v_i \leq tw_i, \\ \delta_2(v_i - \alpha(v)) & : 0 \geq v_i \geq tw_i. \end{cases}$$

It now follows from (9) that $tw \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta_2}(v)$. □

As an immediate consequence, we obtain the following statement about the accessibility of $\mathcal{S}$.

Lemma 3.4 (Main Lemma)**.** *For all $\epsilon > 0$, $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $x, y \in N \setminus \{0\}$ with $\measuredangle(x,y) \leq \epsilon^2/(C^2)$, there exists $R \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $Sx = \lambda Ry$ and $[\![S-R]\!] \leq \epsilon$. In particular, $Q\mathcal{S}^*Q$ is accessible.*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that $\|x\| = \|y\| = 1$. Since $\|x-y\| \leq \measuredangle(x,y)$, we have $\|x-y\| \leq \epsilon^2/(C^2)$. It hence follows from the above Lemma that there exist $T \in \mathcal{S}_\epsilon$ and $t \in (0,1]$ such that $Tx = ty$. Now set $R := S \circ T$ and observe that

$$[\![S-R]\!] = [\![S(\mathrm{id}-T)]\!] \leq [\![S]\!][\![\mathrm{id}-T]\!] \leq \epsilon.$$

In order to prove accessibility, note that $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon \subset \mathcal{S}^*$ for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Hence, if $S \in \mathcal{S}^*$, then $R = S \circ T \in \mathcal{S}^*$ for ϵ sufficiently small. It now follows from Lemma 3.2 and $\mathrm{GL}(N) \cong \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(\mathbb{R})$ that $Q\mathcal{S}^*Q$ is accessible. □

As the final ingredient of the proof of the main theorem, recall the Bochi-Viana dichotomy established in [2] for accessible cocycles.

Lemma 3.5 (Corollary 1 in [2])**.** *Assume that (f,μ) is ergodic and $\mathfrak{G} \subset GL_n(\mathbb{R})$ is accessible. Then there exists a residual subset $\mathcal{R} \subset C^0(M,\mathfrak{G})$ such that any $A \in \mathcal{R}$ either has all Lyapunov exponents equal at almost* *every point, or there exists a dominated splitting of* $M \times \mathbb{R}^n$ *which coincides with the Oseledets splitting almost everywhere.*

We are now in position to prove the Main Theorem in the introduction.

Proof of the Main Theorem. Since $\mathcal{S}^*$ is open and dense in $\mathcal{S}$ by Lemma 3.1, it suffices to find a residual subset inside $\mathcal{S}^*$. Since $Q\mathcal{S}^*Q$ is accessible by Lemma 3.4, it follows from Lemma 3.5, that there exists a residual subset $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$ of $Q\mathcal{S}^*Q$ such that each normal cocycle $\hat{S} \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}$ satisfies the Bochi-Viana dichotomy. Now, with Θ defined as in (8), set $\mathcal{R} := \Theta^{-1}(\hat{\mathcal{R}} \times \hat{\Delta}_n) \cap \mathcal{S}^*$. Since Θ is a homeomorphism, $\mathcal{R}$ is a residual subset of $\mathcal{S}^*$.

It hence remains to show that the Oseledets splitting of each $S \in \mathcal{R}$ is dominated. By intersecting $\mathcal{R}$ with the open and dense set given by Corollary 2.4, we may additionally assume that always $\dim(E^0) = 1$, $E^{<0}$ is a uniformly contracting bundle and that $E^0 \oplus E^{<0}$ is a dominated splitting. Note that $E^{<0}$ is never trivial since $n \geq 2$. By applying the Bochi-Viana dichotomy, the proof now reduces to the following two cases.

1. If the Lyapunov spectrum of $\hat{S}$ is almost surely equal to $\{\lambda\}$ for some $\lambda < 0$, then Lemma 2.2 in combination with $\dim(E_0) = 1$ implies that the Lyapunov spectrum of S is almost surely equal to $\{0, \lambda\}$. The assertion then follows from the fact that $E^0 \oplus E^{<0}$ is a dominated splitting.
2. If the Lyapunov spectrum of $\hat{S}$ is not a singleton, then, for each non-minimal Lyapunov exponent λ, Lemma 3.5 implies that $\hat{E}^\lambda \oplus \hat{E}^{<\lambda}$ is a dominated splitting. It then follows from Lemma 2.3 that the lifted splitting also is dominated. Since also $E^0 \oplus E^{<0}$ is dominated, we then obtain that the Oseledets splitting is a dominated splitting.

This proves the theorem. □

4. An application to relative transfer operators

In order to introduce the relevant skew product, we construct a continuous partition of $[0, 1]$ as follows. Assume that $\ell : M \to \mathrm{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{R})$, $x \mapsto \ell^x$ is a continuous map with $(\ell^x)_{ij} > 0$ and $\sum_{i,j} (\ell^x)_{ij} = 1$. This uniquely defines a a collection $\{I^x_{ij} \subset [0, 1] : 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}$ of closed intervals with pairwise disjoint interiors such that $(\ell^x)_{ij} = |I^x_{ij}|$, $\bigcup_{ij} I^x_{ij} = [0, 1]$ where the intervals are arranged according to the lexicographical ordering. In particular, the ordering implies that $I^x_i := \bigcup_{j=1}^n I^x_{ij}$ is always a closed interval and that $\{I^x_{ij}\}$ varies continuously with $x \in M$. For future reference, we will refer to ℓ as a *continuous family of partitions* of $[0, 1]$ with n^2 atoms.

The collection of intervals then gives rise to the construction of a family of piecewise affine maps $\{T_x : x \in M\}$ of the interval by defining T_x restricted to I^x_{ij} as the unique orientating preserving, affine map with $T_x(I^x_{ij}) = I^{f(x)}_j$, for all $x \in M$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Moreover, by identifying $[0, 1]$ with the circle

$\mathbb{S}^1$, we have that each T_x is an n-fold cover of $\mathbb{S}^1$ and that

$$T : \mathbb{S}^1 \times M \to \mathbb{S}^1 \times M,\ (\omega, x) \mapsto (T_x(\omega), f(x)).$$

is a continuous dynamical system with $D(T_{f(x)} \circ T_x) > 1$. Also recall that the relative Ruelle operator is defined by $\mathcal{L}_x(f)(\xi) := \sum_{T_x(\eta)=\xi} f(\eta)/D(T_x(\eta))$, for $\xi \in [0,1]$, $x \in M$ and $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ (see, e.g., [3]). Furthermore, with λ referring to the Lebesgue measure and for $x \in M$, set

$$\mathcal{E}_x := \left\{ \big(f_x : \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{R}, \omega \mapsto f_x(\omega)\big) : f_x|_{I_j^x} \text{ is } \lambda\text{-a.s. constant}, 1 \le j \le n \right\}.$$

Then, the relative transfer operator acts on $\mathcal{E} := \{\mathcal{E}_x \ : \ x \in M\}$, that is $\mathcal{L}_x : \mathcal{E}_x \to \mathcal{E}_{f(x)}$, and can be identified through $\mathcal{E}_x \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ with the linear cocycle A defined by $(A^x)_{ij} := |I_{ij}^x|/|I_j^{f(x)}|$ (see, e.g., [3]). Moreover, λ is a $(-\log(DT))$- relative Gibbs measure. This then implies that the gauge function, that is the relative spectral radius of $\mathcal{L}_x$ (referred to as A in [3]) is equal to the constant function 1. As an application of Theorem 3.2 in [3], there exists a continuous family of invariant probability densities. Combining the continuity with the identifications in Corollary 4.2 and Remark 4.4 in [6] then shows that these densities might be identified with elements in $\mathbb{R}^n_+$. Hence, there exists a continuous map $h : M \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \mapsto h_x$ with $h > 0$ such that $(h_x)^t A^x = (h_{f(x)})^t$, where $(\cdot)^t$ refers to the matrix transpose. For the linear cocycle B defined by $(B^x)_{ij} := (h_x)_i (A^x)_{ij}/(h_{f(x)})_j$ it then follows that $uB^x = u$ for all $x \in M$. Since the coordinates of B are positive, $x \mapsto (B^x)^t$ defines an element of $C^0(M, \mathcal{S}^n)$ and, in particular, our main theorem is applicable. However, due to the transpose, we have to consider f^{-1} instead of f and define the Lyapunov exponents by

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|vB^x \cdots B^{f^{-(n-1)}(x)}\|.$$

By a straightforward coboundary argument, one then easily obtains the following conclusions for the generic action of $\{\mathcal{L}_x\}$.

Proposition 4.1. *There exists a residual subset $\mathcal{R}$ of the set of continuous families of partitions of $[0,1]$ with n^2 atoms such that for each $\ell \in \mathcal{R}$ the action of the associated Ruelle operator on $\mathcal{E}$ satisfies the following. The splitting $E^0_M \oplus E^{<0}_M$ is dominated, $E^{<0}_M$ is uniformly contracting and $E^0_x = h_x\mathbb{R}$, for all $x \in M$. Furthermore, we either have that*

1. *the Lyapunov spectrum contains two points, or*
2. *the Lyapunov spectrum contains at least three points and the Oseledets splitting extends to a dominated splitting.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge support by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia and the Centro de Matemática da Universidade do Porto. The first author is partially supported through project PTDC/MAT/099-493/2008, whereas the second author was supported by the individual grant

SFRH/BPD/39195/2007 while writing the major part of this note. The second author would like to express his gratitude for the warm hospitality and excellent working conditions at the University of the Porto.

Furthermore, we are grateful to the referee for valuable comments on an earlier draft of this paper. These were very helpful for improving the content of the paper.

References

[1] T. Bogenschütz and V. Gundlach, *Ruelle's transfer operator for random subshifts of finite type*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, 15 (1995), 413–447.

[2] J. Bochi and M. Viana, *The Lyapunov exponents of generic volume-preserving and symplectic maps*, Ann. Math., 161 (2005), 1423–1485.

[3] M. Denker and M. Gordin, *Gibbs measures for fibred systems*, Adv. Math., 2 (1999), 161–192.

[4] G. Froyland, S. Lloyd and A. Quas, *Coherent structures and isolated spectrum for Perron-Frobenius cocycles*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, 3 (2010), 729–756.

[5] M. Hirsch, C. Pugh, and M. Shub, *Invariant manifolds*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 583. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977.

[6] M. Stadlbauer, *On random topological Markov chains with big images and preimages*, Stoch. Dyn., 10 (2010), 77–95.

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade da Beira Interior, Rua Marquês d'Ávila e Bolama, 6201-001 Covilhã, Portugal

Departamento de Matemática Universidade Federal da Bahia Av. Ademar de Barros s/n 40170-110 Salvador, BA, Brasil

E-mail address: `bessa@fc.up.pt`

E-mail address: `Manuel.Stadlbauer@ufba.br`